

**Communication and Public Outreach**  
**April 29-30 Leadership Council Meeting**  
**Preliminary summary of written comments received**

This report presents an overview of public comments received by the Puget Sound Partnership from January 1, 2008 through April 14, 2008.

**Statistical Summary of Comments**

---

To date, the Partnership has received 111 e-mail comments, 3 written letters, 104 written comments from the action area meeting comment forms, 117 comments from the Web site and 66 comments from other sources.

All comments were organized into the following general categories.\*

<b>Category</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Comments</b>
• Six Partnership Goals		○ Education/Outreach	54
○ Habitat/Land Use	93	○ Funding	6
○ Human Health	28	○ Monitoring/Adaptive Management	19
○ Quality of Life	2	○ Research/Modeling	9
○ Species/Biodiversity	34	• Climate Change	5
○ Water Quality	43	• Volunteering	11
○ Water Quantity	15	• Program Inventory	5
• Cross-Topic Themes		• Logistical Questions	59
○ Accountability	31		

\* Note: multiple themed comments were placed in more than one category.

**Comments regarding Puget Sound status and threats**

---

- **Education and outreach.** Some common thoughts included:
  - Lack of awareness about the state of the Sound and a lack of personal connection to the Sound's health
  - Need for more incentives to do the "right" thing, such as use soft shore armoring techniques or install pervious driveways
  - Lack of best management practices, training, and assistance for on-the-ground practitioners and individual households
  - Lack of consistent, visible messaging
- **More detail needed.** Several respondents indicated that descriptions of Puget Sound's health and threats need more refining.
- **Non-point source pollution.**
  - Stormwater
  - Faulty septic systems
- **Land conversion and development.** Frequent thoughts expressed included:
  - Need for more Low Impact Development (LID), including training seminars and retrofitting for existing developments
  - Need for incentives for sustainable development and shoreline management
  - Concerns about tree loss and clear-cutting

- **Shellfish farming.** Some commonly heard thoughts included:
  - More science is needed to study the ecological effects of large-scale aquaculture, in particular geoduc farming
  - Water quality should be protected to ensure the future viability of shellfish farming
- **Protection of key species and conservation of undisturbed habitat.**
  - Species mentioned included salmon, orcas, and shorebirds
  - Habitat loss
- **Toxics.** Specific concerns included:
  - Degraded urban areas and industrial/toxic sites (e.g. Duwamish River, Tacoma)
  - Lack of science pertaining to ecological effects of toxics
  - Use of toxic substances by individual consumers
  - Dioxins in Port Townsend and Olympia/Budd Inlet
- **Water conservation**
  - Enforceable in-stream flow levels
- **Lack of enforcement** of existing laws and permitting requirements
- **Potential oil spills**
- **Population growth**
- **Climate change**

### **Comments regarding criteria to prioritize actions for the Action Agenda**

---

Respondents preferred actions that include:

- Public participation and support
- Effective training and education to facilitate behavior change
- Sustainable/long-term solutions
- Targeting of multiple goals and benefits and resulting in large impacts
- Consideration for cost-effectiveness and ecological economics
- Improved coordination between organizations
- Prevention and removal of toxics in the Sound
- Protection of key species, such as salmon and listed species

### **Conclusion**

---

Comments covered a wide range of topics and represented diverse points of view. A compendium of all comments received between January 1, 2008 and April 14, 2008 is available upon request.